1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

In other words, the first sentence which you are amending is contained in Article 13 almost verbatim, and it has worked there. There is no reason why it shouldn't continue to work.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me restate the motion as I now understand it to be. If you will refer back to Section 11.01 (b), second paragraph. I understand that the purpose of the motion, not the exact phrasing of it, the purpose of the motion is to rephrase the first sentence of the second paragraph of 11.01 (b) so as to provide that no new County shall be created without the consent of the majority of the voters voting thereon who reside within each County merged voting separately. That is stated very poorly, but the general idea is that the referendum will be a separate referendum requiring a majority vote of the voters of each County which is a party to the merger. Is the question clear?

COVERNOR LANE: Each to decide Yes or No?

THE CHAIRMAN: And you must have the affirmative Yes for both or all three before the merger can be accomplished. That differs from the present sentence